

H



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,969	03/15/2001	William Ender	ONS00230	3926

7590 10/06/2003

Robert D. Atkins  
Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC  
Patent Administration Dept - MD A230  
P.O. Box 62890  
Phoenix, AZ 85082-2890

EXAMINER
----------

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/805,969

Applicant(s)

ENDER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

This is in response to Application dated March 15, 2001 in which claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “updating system” or “update system” in claims 1 and 5 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Specification does not discuss internal and external information.

Art Unit: 2171

3. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 13, it is not clear what Applicant mean by “internal information” and “external information” and why the method would utilize the difference information to alter the external information.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trenbeath et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,324,587) in view of Martin, Jr. et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,304,860).

Regarding claim 1, Trenbeath discloses an information management system organized to maintain an accurate representation of a list of data objects, comprising:

- a system of record coupled to receive data objects (see col. 3, lines 39-43 and col. 9, lines 36-38, Trenbeath). “The publication folder” (108, Fig. 5B) corresponds to “system of record” that receives data objects;
- an updating system coupled to receive the data objects from the system of record and coupled to provide the data objects organized into a first list of data objects in a first format (see col.6, lines 57-61 and col. 9, lines 36-41, Trenbeath). “client A” (publication client) corresponds to an “updating system” that

Art Unit: 2171

- providing the data objects organized into a list of data objects with its appropriated format (110, Fig. 5B, Trenbeath); and
- a directory coupled to receive the first list of data objects and coupled to provide a second list of data objects in a second format (see Fig. 7 and col. 12, line 51 to col. 13, line 3, Trenbeath). “folder directory” (Fig. 7) containing a “publication folder” (190, Fig. 7) is the first list of data objects and “subscription folder” (192, Fig. 7) is the second list of data objects.

Trenbeath, however, does not disclose “the updating system at the predetermined Intervals”. Martin, on the other hand, discloses an automated transaction information system that updates periodically (see col. 5, lines 9-13 and col. 6, lines 7-11, Martin). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Trenbeath to include the claimed feature as taught by Martin because it is efficient~~y~~ and provides the user with direct and timely access to the information (see col. 8, lines 25-32, Martin).

Regarding claim 2, Trenbeath/Martin combination discloses a graphical interface coupled to provide a data input mechanism to the system of record and coupled to provide a data output mechanism from the system of record (see col. 1, lines 51-57 and Fig. 1, Martin). ATM corresponds to a graphical interface; and a communication interface coupled to provide two-way communication between the system of record (18 “CONSUMER’S BANK”, Fig. 2, Martin) and the updating system (see 14 “TRANSACTION”, Fig. 2 and col. 9, lines 45-49 and 14, Martin).

Regarding claim 3, Trenbeath/Martin combination discloses the updating system comprises a file transfer mechanism coupled to transfer the first list of data objects and coupled

to transfer the second list of data objects at the predetermined intervals (see col. 9, line 45 to col. 10, line4, Martin).

Regarding claim 4, Trenbeath/Martin combination discloses a first directory server coupled to receive the first list of data objects and coupled to provide the second list of data objects; and a second directory server coupled to receive the first list of data objects from the first directory server to maintain redundant sets of the first list of data objects (see col. 8, lines 52 and col. 9, lines 20-31 and Fig. 3A, Trenbeath).

5. Claims 5-9 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trenbeath et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,324,587) in view of Man-Hak Tso (U. S. Patent no. 5,706,509).

Regarding claim 5, Trenbeath discloses an information management system coupled to maintain synchronization of first data objects contained within a first storage area to second data objects contained within a second storage area, the information management system comprising:

- a directory coupled to receive the first data objects and coupled to store the data objects into the first storage area. “folder directory” (Fig. 7) containing a “publication folder” (190, Fig.7) is containing the first list of data objects in the root directory;
- an event system coupled to detect a first set of all changes made to the first data objects (see col. 18, lines35-45, Trenbeath); and
- an update system coupled to receive the second set of changes and coupled to modify the second data objects in response to the second set of changes (see col. 10, line 62 to col. 11, line5 and col. 11, lines 10-17, Trenbeath).

Trenbeath, however, does not explicitly disclose “a second set of changes equal to a portion of the first set of all changes”. Man-Hak Tso, on the other hand, discloses this limitation (see col. 2, lines 56-60 and abstract of Man-Hak Tso). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Trenbeath to include the step of equating the first set of data objects to the second set of data objects. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide implementing synchronization of data between applications with different data formats (see col. 2, lines 46-48, Man-Hak Tso).

Regarding claim 6, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses a directory server (“SERVER”, 90, Fig. 3A, Trenbeath) coupled to receive the first data objects in (“Client C”, 88, Fig. 3A) and coupled to provide the first data objects to the first storage area contained within the directory server; and a connection server (“SERVER”, 86, Fig. 3A) coupled to receive the first data objects from the first storage area in (“Client a”, 80, Fig. 3A) and coupled to provide the second data objects to the second storage area.

Regarding claim 7, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses an event monitor coupled to receive the first set of changes made to the first data objects (see col. 4, lines 33-45, Man-Hak Tso); and a log application coupled to receive the first set of changes and coupled to provide the second set of changes at predetermined time intervals (see col. 17, lines 57-65 and col. 18, line 64 to col. 19, line 5, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 8, Trenbeath discloses a method of operating an automatically updated information management system, comprising:

- editing a first data object in a first device (see col. 10, lines 14-18, Trenbeath);

Art Unit: 2171

- detecting changes made to the first data object in the first device (see col. 10, lines 18-22, Trenbeath).

Trenbeath, however, does not explicitly disclose “equating a second data object to the first data object upon detection of the changes made to the first data object”. Man-Hak Tso, on the other hand, discloses this limitation (see col. 2, lines 56-60 and abstract of Man-Hak Tso). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Trenbeath to include the step of equating the first set of data objects to the second set of data objects. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide implementing synchronization of data between applications with different data formats (see col. 2, lines 46-48, Man-Hak Tso).

Regarding claim 9, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses authenticating a user at a data terminal (see col. 19, lines 43-50, Trenbeath); and performing a data edit operation within the first device (see col. 9, lines 25-31, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 11, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses executing an event services function within the first device; and logging events from the event services function (see col. 22, lines 19-31, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 12, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses examining the logged events that affect the second data object; and updating the second data objects affected by the logged events to equate the second data objects to the first data objects (see col. 5, lines 36-43, Man-Hak Tso).

Regarding claim 13, Trenbeath discloses a method of using an information management system to validate an external set of information, comprising:



Art Unit: 2171

- storing a set of internal information in a directory (see col. 12, lines 51-55 and col. 14, lines 37-40, Trenbeath). “internal information” corresponds to the message stored in folder publishing;
- receiving a set of external information (see col. 14, lines 41-48). “external information” corresponds to data object receiving;
- comparing the set of external information to the set of internal information to produce a set of difference information (see col. 14, lines 48-54, Trenbeath).

Trenbeath, however, does not explicitly disclose “utilizing the set of difference information”. Man-Hak Tso, on the other hand, discloses this limitation (see col. 2, lines 56-60 and abstract of Man-Hak Tso). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Trenbeath to include the step of equating the first set of data objects to the second set of data objects. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide implementing synchronization of data between applications with different data formats (see col. 2, lines 46-48, Man-Hak Tso).

Regarding claim 14, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses receiving a set of external information in a directory comprises engaging a first file transfer function at predetermined intervals to place a file of information into a repository (see col. 17, lines 57-65 and col. 18, line 64 to col.19, line 5, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 15, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses engaging a second file transfer function at the predetermined intervals to retrieve the file of information from the repository (see col. 17, lines 57-65 and col. 18, line 64 to col.19, line 5, Trenbeath); and

Art Unit: 2171

comparing the file of information to the internal information to produce the difference information (see col. 19, lines 60 to col. 20, line 5, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 16, Trenbeath/Man-Hak Tso combination further discloses utilizing the set of difference information to alter the set of external information comprises engaging a scrubbing function to create an error report utilized to correct errors in the external information (see col. 2, lines 56-60 and abstract of Man-Hak Tso).

6. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,158,007) in view of Trenbeath et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,324,587).

Regarding claim 17, Moreh discloses a method of using an information management system to facilitate a new hiring process, comprising:

- entering data associated with a new employee into a directory (see Fig. 6 and col. 11, lines 3-7, Moreh); and
- adding the employee to an updating function of the information management system (see col. 11, lines 33-41, Moreh).

Moreh, however, does not explicitly disclose “automatically requesting employee services from within the directory”. Trenbeath, on the other hand, discloses an automatic updated data object in the directory folder (see col. 11, lines 58-67, Trenbeath) so that the updated information is available to request. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Moreh to automatically inquire the information in the directory as taught by Trenbeath. The motivation of doing so would have been to make the most current version of the data ever available (see col. 4, lines 8-19, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 18, Moreh/Trenbeath combination further discloses authenticating a user at a data terminal (see col. 7, lines 21-23, Moreh); and performing a data edit operation within the information management system to add data objects associated with the new employee (see col. 11, lines 33-41, Moreh).

Regarding claim 19, Moreh/Trenbeath combination further discloses electronic mail accounts, and electronic schedulers (see col. 6, lines 47-52, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 20, Moreh/Trenbeath combination further discloses that the automatic file transfer mechanism synchronizes employee data between a first device and a second device (see col. 18, line 64 to col. 19, line4, Trenbeath).

Regarding claim 21, Moreh/Trenbeath combination further discloses triggering an event in response to adding the employee (see col. 25, lines 50-56, Trenbeath); and initiating a data transfer from a first system to a second system in response to the event (see col. 25, lines 16-42, Trenbeath).

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trenbeath et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,324,587) in view of Man-Hak Tso (U. S. Patent no. 5,706,509) and further view of Reber et al. (U. S. Patent no. 5,995,105).

Regarding claim 10, Trenbeath and Man-Hak Tso combination discloses all of the claimed limitation as discussed above, except “authenticating the user at a wireless data terminal”. But it is well known to authenticate a user at a wireless device as evidence by Reber (see col. 10, lines 53-61, Reber). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Trenbeath and Man-Hak Tso because it is convenient and provide the user the flexibility of accessing internet service resources.

Art Unit: 2171


*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai ~~HT~~  
Art Unit 2171  
September 21, 2003

  
UYEN LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
AU 217